

R E M A R K S

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

SUPPORT FOR THE CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification, for example, on page 5 lines 10-21, page 6 line 20 to page 7 line 7, page 9 lines 13-19, page 13 lines 1-2 and FIGS. 2-5, as originally filed. Thus, no new matter has been added.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The objection to the specification has been obviated by amendment and should be withdrawn. The reference numbers have been changed per the suggestion in the Office Action.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

The specification discloses on page 12 lines 7-12 that a supplemental decoder (as represented by the second integrated circuit 114a) is one of multiple decoders that may be used to decompress the signal received at the input 112 of the remote device 114. A possible implementation of the connection 117 between the remote device 114 and the second integrated circuit

114a is described on page 11 lines 11-14 of the specification as a Universal Serial Bus (USB). Since a USB is a serial bus and the second integrated circuit 114a is operating from the same signal as the other decoders in the remote device 114, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the specification to describe a supplemental decoder coupled to at least one of the remote devices through a serial interface to receive at least one of the compressed data streams through the serial interface, as presently claimed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 14, 21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Gelman et al. '532 (hereafter Gelman) has been obviated in part by amendment, is respectfully traversed in part, and should be withdrawn.

Gelman concerns a communications architecture and method for distributing information services (title).

Claims 1 and 14 are independently patentable over the cited reference. Claim 1 provides that (A) each of the remote devices comprising a first decoder circuit, the first decoder circuit being configured to decode and decompress at least one of the one or more compressed data streams received from the control server and (B) each of the navigation software modules is configured to (i) generate one or more control signals that program a respective one of the first decoder circuits in response to one

or more user options entered at the respective remote device. Claim 14 provides similar language. The Office Action alleges that a Central Office (CO) Buffer 44 of Gelman is allegedly similar to the claimed navigation software and Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) 70 of Gelman is allegedly similar to the claimed remote devices. In contrast, Gelman does not appear to describe programming of a decoder 73 within the CPE 70 by the CO Buffer 44 of Gelman.

FIG. 4 of Gelman appears to disclose three software elements of the CO buffer 44, scripts, map information and a buffer operating system. In contrast, Gelman appears to be silent that any of the scripts, map information and/or buffer operating system program the decoder 73. All of the instructions transmitted from the CO buffer 44 to the CPE 70 of Gelman appear to be directed to a graphics overlay processor 74, not the decoder 73. Therefore, Gelman does not appear to expressly or inherently describe that each of the navigation software modules is configured to generate one or more control signals that program a respective one of the first decoder circuits in response to one or more user options entered at the respective remote device, as presently claimed. As such, claims 1 and 14 are fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is independently patentable over the cited reference. Claim 6 provides that a particular one of the compressed data streams is presented to two or more of the remote

devices at a particular time. In contrast, the Office Action argues that Gelman "inherently may transmit a move from the IFW 10 to a plurality of subscribers." However, MPEP §2112 requires the Office to provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art. In contrast, no evidence or line of reasoning has been provided in the Office Action to support the assertion that a movie transmitted from the IFW 10 of Gelman is necessarily received by multiple CPE's 70. Therefore, inherency has not been established and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 6, 21 and 25 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 or 14, which are now believed to be allowable. As such, the dependent claims are fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejections should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Gelman in view of Beyers '590 has been obviated by amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 5, 12, 13, 16 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Gelman in view of Maeda et al. '546 (hereafter Maeda) has been obviated by amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Gelman in view of Akamatsu et al. '132 (hereafter Akamatsu) has been obviated by amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 22-24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Gelman in view of Sokawa et al. '460 (hereafter Sokawa) has been obviated by amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Gelman in view of Maeda and Sokawa has been obviated by amendment and should be withdrawn.

Gelman concerns a communications architecture and method for distributing information services (title). Beyers concerns a system for data channel level control (title). Maeda concerns multiplex data transmitting and receiving equipment (title). Akamatsu concerns a receiver set, information apparatus and receiving system (title). Sokawa concerns a television receiver, video signal processing device, image processing device and image processing method (title).

Claim 12 is independently patentable over the cited references. Claim 12 provides that (A) each of the remote devices comprising a first decoder circuit, the first decoder circuit being configured to decode and decompress at least one of the one or more compressed data streams received from the control server and (B) each of the decoder control circuits is configured to control a

respective one of the navigation software modules for programming of a respective one of the first decoder circuits within the remote devices. The Office Action alleges that a Central Office (CO) Buffer 44 of Gelman is allegedly similar to the claimed navigation software and Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) 70 of Gelman is allegedly similar to the claimed remote devices. In contrast, Gelman does not appear to describe programming of a decoder 73 within the CPE 70 by the CO Buffer 44 of Gelman.

FIG. 4 of Gelman appears to disclose three software elements of the CO buffer 44, scripts, map information and a buffer operating system. In contrast, Gelman appears to be silent that any of the scripts, map information and/or buffer operating system program the decoder 73. All of the instructions transmitted from the CO buffer 44 to the CPE 70 of Gelman appear to be directed to a graphics overlay processor 74, not the decoder 73. Therefore, Gelman and Maeda, alone or in combination, does not appear to render obvious that each of the decoder control circuits is configured to control a respective one of the navigation software modules for programming of a respective one of the first decoder circuits within the remote devices, as presently claimed.

Claim 12 further provides a plurality of decoder control circuit within the control server, each of the decoder control circuits being configured to control a respective one of the navigation software control modules. In contrast, Gelman appears to be silent regarding any circuit within the CO 40 that controls

any of the scripts, map information and/or buffer operating system program within the CO buffers 44. Therefore, Gelman and Maeda, alone or in combination, do not appear to render obvious a plurality of decoder control circuit within the control server, each of the decoder control circuits being configured to control a respective one of the navigation software control modules, as presently claimed.

Furthermore, the Office Action asserts that claim 12 is rejected under the same reasoning as claim 1. However, claim 1 does not include the decoder control circuit limitations. No other arguments are made in the rejection to explain why Gelman or Maeda allegedly disclose a circuit similar to the claimed decoder control circuit. Therefore, a case of *prima facie* obviousness has not been established and the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

Claim 13 is independently patentable over the cited reference. Claim 13 provides that (i) each of the navigation software modules is configured to generate one or more control signals and (ii) the first decoder circuits are configured to generate the at least one of the decoded video signal and the decoded audio signal in response to the one or more control signals. Despite the assertion in the Office Action, Gelman appears to be silent that any of the scripts, map information and/or buffer operating system send a control signal used by the decoder 73. All of the instructions transmitted from the CO buffer 44 to the CPE 70 of Gelman appear to be directed to a graphics

overlay processor 74, not the decoder 73. Therefore, Gelman and Maeda, alone or in combination, do not appear to render obvious that each of the navigation software modules is configured to generate one or more control signals and the first decoder circuits are configured to generate the at least one of the decoded video signal and the decoded audio signal in response to the one or more control signals, as presently claimed. As such, claim 13 is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 22, 27 and 28 are independently patentable over the cited references. Claim 22 provides that at least one of the remote devices further comprises a second decoder circuit capable of decoding and decompressing (a compressed data stream) in accordance with a second compression standard being different than a first compression standard of the first decoder circuit. Claims 27 and 28 provide similar language. The Office Action cites an NTSC decoder 1015, a MUSE decoder 1016 and a digital decoder 1017 as teaching multiple decoding standards. However, neither the NTSC decoder 1015 nor the MUSE decoder 1016 of Sokawa can decode and/or decompress a compressed data stream similar to the stream transmitted by the Information Warehouse (IFW) 10 of Gelman.

In particular, column 5 lines 20-45 of Gelman describe a broadband integrated servers digital network for carrying the video information from the IFW 10 to the CO's 40. Column 6 lines 17-29 of Gelman describe an asynchronous digital subscriber line for

carrying the video information from the CO's 40 to the CPE's 70. As such, the video information received by the decoder 73 of Gelman is compressed and encoded in the digital domain. In contrast, the NTSC decoder 1015 and the MUSE decoder 1016 of Sokawa operate in the analog domain to convert the video information from one format to another. The decoders 1015 and 1016 of Sokawa do not decode previously encoded video. The decoders 1015 and 1016 of Sokawa do not decompress previously compressed video. Therefore, Gelman, Maeda and Sokawa, alone or in combination, do not appear to render obvious that at least one of the remote devices further comprises a second decoder circuit capable of decoding and decompressing in accordance with a second compression standard being different than a first compression standard of the first decoder circuit, as presently claimed. As such, claims 22, 27 and 28 are fully patentable over the cited references and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claims 23 is independently patentable over the cited references. Claim 23 provides a supplemental decoder coupled to at least one of the remote devices through a serial interface to receive at least one of the compressed data streams through the serial interface, the supplemental decoder decoding and decompressing in accordance with a third compression standard different than the first compression standard and the second compression standard. Despite the assertion in the Office Action, the format conversion section 1100 of Sokawa does not appear to be

capable of decoding an encoded data stream or decompressing a compressed data stream. In contrast, the format conversion section 1100 only appears to convert from the various input formats to a display format. Therefore, Gelman and Sokawa, alone or in combination, do not appear to render obvious a supplemental decoder coupled to at least one of the remote devices through a serial interface to receive at least one of the compressed data streams through the serial interface, the supplemental decoder decoding and decompressing in accordance with a third compression standard different than the first compression standard and the second compression standard, as presently claimed. As such, claim 23 is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 24 is independently patentable over the cited references. Claim 24 provides that the supplemental decoder comprises an additional decoder circuit. Despite the assertion in the Office Action, the image processors 1040 and 1041 of Sokawa do not appear to be decoders. In particular, column 12, lines 29-39 of Sokawa describes the processor 1040 as a video signal processing device that converts a selected video signal into a display format. Column 14 lines 7-13 of Sokawa provides a similar description for the processor 1041. In contrast, Sokawa appears to be silent that either processor 1040 and 1041 can decode an encoded/compressed data stream. Furthermore, the video signals received by the processors 1040/1041 appear to be received in non-encoded formats.

Therefore, Gelman and Sokawa, alone or in combination, do not appear to render obvious that the supplemental decoder comprises an additional decoder circuit, as presently claimed. As such, claim 24 is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 19 is independently patentable over the cited references. Claim 19 provides that each of the cables comprise a serial bus. In contrast, no grounds of rejection or arguments are presented against claim 19. As such, anticipation/obviousness has not been established and claim 19 should be allowed.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 22-24 and 26-28 depend from independent claims 1, 12 and 14, which are now believed to be allowable. As such, the dependent claims are fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.


Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicant's representative at 586-498-0670 between 9:00 am and 5:00 pm Eastern time should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge Deposit
Account No. 12-2252.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.



John J. Ignatowski
Registration No. 36,555

Dated: June 10, 2008

c/o Lloyd Sadler
LSI Logic Corporation

Docket No.: A4-4265/1C/1C / 1496.00002c